UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

vs.

Case No. 18-CR-146-JDP-1

PETER JEWELL-REIGEL,

Madison, Wisconsin March 7, 2019

Defendant.

2:00 p.m.

STENOGRAPHIC TRANSCRIPT OF SENTENCING HEARING HELD BEFORE CHIEF JUDGE JAMES D. PETERSON

APPEARANCES:

For the Plaintiff:

Office of the United States Attorney BY: ELIZABETH ALTMAN Assistant United States Attorney 222 West Washington Avenue, Suite 700 Madison, Wisconsin 53703

For the Defendant:

Federal Defender Services of Wisconsin, Inc. BY: JOSEPH A. BUGNI Madison Branch Office 22 East Mifflin Street, Suite 1000 Madison, Wisconsin 53703

Also Present:

Peter Jewell-Reigel, Defendant Richard Williams, U.S. Probation Officer

CHERYL A. SEEMAN, RMR, CRR
Official Court Reporter
United States District Court
120 North Henry Street, Room 410
Madison, Wisconsin 53703
1-608-261-5708

(Called to order 2 p.m.)

2.0

THE CLERK: Case No. 18-CR-146-JDP-1, United

States of America v. Peter Jewell-Reigel. Court is called for sentencing. May we have the appearances, please?

MS. ALTMAN: Good afternoon, Your Honor. United States appears by Elizabeth Altman.

THE COURT: Good afternoon.

MR. BUGNI: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Joe Bugni appearing on.

Behalf of Peter Jewell-Reigel.

THE COURT: Mr. Jewell-Reigel, Mr. Bugni, good afternoon to you. Rich Williams is the probation officer who prepared the presentence report and he's in the courtroom with us here today. Let me review the materials that I have reviewed in connection with the sentencing to make sure I didn't miss anything.

I've got the presentence report, statement from the government that there were no objections to the presentence report. I have some clarifications from the defendant, no objections that affected the guideline, anyway. Then I've got an addendum and a revised presentence report, a sentencing memorandum from both sides. And then the defendant's sentencing memorandum kind of came in installments. I have three submissions, so three of those from you. So that's what I have.

```
Did I miss anything from your side, Ms. Altman?
 1
 2
            MS. ALTMAN: Not from my side, Your Honor.
 3
             THE COURT: Mr. Bugni?
            MR. BUGNI: No, Your Honor.
 4
 5
             THE COURT: I think I have everything. All
 6
            So do we have anybody that we're going to hear
7
   from besides you, Ms. Altman?
            MS. ALTMAN:
 8
                          No.
 9
             THE COURT: Witnesses have been notified, but
10
   they're not here?
            MS. ALTMAN: Correct.
11
12
             THE COURT:
                       All right. And, Mr. Bugni, I'll hear
13
   from you and Mr. Jewell-Reigel, I suppose?
14
            MR. BUGNI: That's correct, Your Honor.
15
             THE COURT: Nobody else?
16
            MR. BUGNI: No, Your Honor.
17
             THE COURT: All right. So, Mr. Jewell-Reigel, I
18
   need to make sure that you've read the presentence report
19
   and the revised presentence report and the addendum and
20
   that you discussed all those documents with your lawyer.
21
   Have you done that?
22
             THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.
23
             THE COURT: You can pull the microphone over a
24
   little closer to you so you don't have to lean into it, so
25
   just keep it close to you. That's good. So you've read
```

1 it --2 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor. 3 THE COURT: -- and talked about it with your 4 Do you have any other concerns with the 5 presentence report? THE DEFENDANT: No, Your Honor. 6 7 THE COURT: All your concerns have been conveyed 8 to me? 9 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 10 THE COURT: And, Mr. Bugni, have the clarifications that you offered been adequately reflected 11 12 in the revised presentence report? 13 MR. BUGNI: They have, Your Honor. 14 THE COURT: Okay. I'll adopt the facts in the 15 presentence report as the facts on which I'll base my 16 sentence and I will accept the plea agreement. I think 17 that the offense of conviction adequately reflects the 18 defendant's criminal conduct. The plea agreement does not undermine the statutory purposes of sentencing. And I 19 2.0 will take into consideration both the advisory sentencing 21 guidelines and the statutory purposes of sentencing that 22 are set out in Title 18 of the United States Code at 23 Section 3553(a). 24 Let me just make a record of where we've landed with

the guidelines. Nobody has objected to them, but let's

25

make that clear. I find that they're correctly calculated in the guidelines.

So I've got a stipulation that although the defendant pleaded guilty to the receipt-of-pornography charge, he stipulated that his conduct involved the production of child pornography, which is a violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 2251, so the guidelines are calculated as though that were the offense. So the base offense level is 32 for that offense.

The Known Victim No. 1 was 12 years old when the defendant exchanged pictures with her, so that is also a two-level increase. We've got the two-level increase and that two-level increase for the age of the victim is in guideline section 2G2.1(b)(1)(B). Then we've got the use of an interactive computer service which produces a two-level increase as a result of guideline section 2G2.1(b)(6)(B)(i). There aren't any other Chapter Two adjustments.

We've got what I believe will be three levels of downward adjustment for acceptance of responsibility because we've got the defendant accepting responsibility by entering a timely plea. And I think the government is prepared to move for the third level, but let's confirm that.

MS. ALTMAN: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: That gives us three levels of downward adjustment. Criminal history category is III, so that gives the defendant an advisory guideline imprisonment range of 168 to 210 months.

I'll stick to my usual practice here and that is that I will depart downward by two levels because the use of the interactive computer service is more or less a common feature of virtually all pornography offenses these days and so I think it exaggerates the culpability when the use of the computer is so routine now and I will depart downward two levels in light of that.

So that would give us an offense level of 31, which would give us a guideline imprisonment range of 135 months to 168 months. So that's kind of what I will regard as a starting point for our discussions based on the guidelines. That's what the guidelines tell us to do, what they suggest we consider.

And I've got sentencing memos from both sides, so we don't need to rehash everything, but we've got the opportunity to provide me some further guidance as I decide what sentence I should impose.

So, Ms. Altman.

MS. ALTMAN: Thank you, Your Honor. I will not rehash anything in my sentencing memorandum. But I do want to indicate that to the extent there is incorrect

1 information in there, that certainly was not intentional. 2 THE COURT: Well, I wouldn't think so, but let's 3 be clear about where the incorrect information is. And I 4 gather the main focus from one of Mr. Bugni's submissions 5 is that the incident with the young lady in the closet, that that person was really 15 years old and I think that 6 7 Mr. Jewell-Reigel was the same age? 15. Yes, sir. MR. BUGNI: 8 THE COURT: 9 They're both 15 at the time. 10 MS. ALTMAN: Correct. I was using the information in paragraph 64 which indicated he was 16 and 11 12 then charged with repeated sexual assault of a child under That's the information I was using. 13 14 THE COURT: So it is understandable confusion. 15 But I gather, now that we've got the fuller information, 16 they were both 15? 17 MS. ALTMAN: Correct. 18 THE COURT: Okay. 19 MS. ALTMAN: I don't dispute that. 20 THE COURT: Yeah. And then the other aspects of 21 it, the two salient features of that paragraph 64, which describes some very horrifying conduct, is that they were 22 23 both 15 and then also the charges were dismissed. 24 So Mr. Bugni makes reference to the discovery file in

that case, which I haven't seen, Mr. Williams hasn't seen.

25

But the bottom line seems to be a pretty plausible conclusion that that isn't really what had happened or they wouldn't have so readily dropped those charges.

MS. ALTMAN: I don't know the answer to that,
Your Honor, and I don't know -- I think an equally -- I
don't know. You could also say that although they were
both 15 and that the court decided that hitting someone
with a sex offense at 15 or the DA's office decided that
charging someone with a sex offense at 16 wasn't
necessary. I don't know. I didn't see the discovery
file. I guess I would hate to speculate on what the
reasons were. I don't have any reason to dispute
Mr. Bugni's characterization of it. That's the best I can
answer to that.

THE COURT: All right.

MS. ALTMAN: Whatever it was, I don't know that it -- well, it doesn't change my recommendation --

THE COURT: Mm-mm.

MS. ALTMAN: -- because he did still spend the three days in jail for whatever the sexual conduct was. And I think my basic point, other than the age, which of course I was wrong, was that that was not part -- it didn't deter him and it didn't keep him from then going on to more egregious -- although still, I don't even want to say, age appropriate -- more egregious behavior. I mean,

his next offense, he was charged with second degree sexual assault of a child. That is more egregious conduct.

What I want to add in addition to my sentencing memorandum is just a couple things. In going through the chats -- and I think, as Mr. Bugni indicated in his, there was pages, and pages, and pages of chats -- but we noticed that there was at least two 16-year-olds that he was having contact with. So it was not just a gaming forum for him; he was also communicating with the two 16-year-olds. We could determine that because he would ask, people he was talking to, he would ask their age. So some of them we don't know how old they were, but we knew there were at least two 16-year-olds.

One of the 16-year-old girls says in the chats that she sent him pictures and gives him a phone number. There's a message from one girl where they talk about chatting on Kik and she says that he creeped her out. One of the girls says she emailed him videos and pictures. He asked for a, quote, "tit pic," unquote, and she says "They're in the video." He then asks her to write something on her breasts and to show to -- quote, "show it daddy," unquote.

So the behavior with the victim in this case, while she was significantly younger than these two 16-year-olds, certainly was not the only time that it happened while he

10 1 was doing this gaming activity. 2 THE COURT: Okay. Because there's the kind of, I 3 don't want to say, lead reference, but there's a very 4 summary reference in the paragraph 34 or thereabouts --5 36: "This review also located nude pictures of other young Investigators weren't able to determine the ages 6 7 of the females in the other images." And so --MS. ALTMAN: It may or may not have been those 8 9 girls. 10 THE COURT: Okay. MS. ALTMAN: I can't say that it was. 11 12 THE COURT: Okay. But the texts demonstrate that 13 he was engaging in sexually oriented communication with at 14 least two 16-year-old girls? 15 MS. ALTMAN: Yes. 16 THE COURT: Okay. All right. 17 MS. ALTMAN: And then just I guess to conclude: 18 This is a tough case. This was a tough case charging. 19 We -- without going into prosecutorial discretion, those 20 sort of things -- we struggled with how to charge it, 21 whether we charge it production, whether we charge it receipt. Of course a production would have had a 15-year 22

THE COURT: I will -- it's not my job to decide

mandatory minimum. No matter what happens, I think we

23

24

25

charged it correctly.

whether it was charged correctly, of course. But I do appreciate and I recognize that you could have charged this far more aggressively, in which my hands would have been tied and I would have had to impose a 15-year mandatory minimum and so I appreciate that. That has not gone unnoticed by me. I do appreciate that.

So you're not -- given the severity of the crime here, and I think it is very serious, this isn't some crazy draconian request that you're making. I'm not saying I'm persuaded or that I'm going to do it exactly, but this is not an off-the-wall request. I think this is a very serious concern, so I appreciate that. Is there anything else?

MS. ALTMAN: Just the end.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. ALTMAN: The defense asks for five years. Five years is the mandatory minimum. Mandatory minimum is for someone with no criminal history, for someone with no aggravating factors, for someone maybe with mitigating factors, and this is not that case.

In this case we have someone who has a history of illegal, inappropriate conduct, some of it more peer related, some of it -- it's all peer related, but some of the girls were just too young. They just, quite frankly, were too young.

He has a criminal history. He has more than one victim, as demonstrated by the other chats or at least attempting to perhaps leading in that way. This isn't a case for a mandatory minimum and that's my bottom line.

THE COURT: Well, let me voice some of my concerns here as I try to deal with what is a difficult case. The one obvious factor is that we've got a very young offender here. This is -- you know, he's a 20-year-old young man that is facing a long prison sentence even at the mandatory minimum. And so we're not talking about a 40-year-old guy here; we're talking about such a young offender, somebody who's never really been in prison. And so that's, you know, that's a strong factor that militates against a long sentence.

MS. ALTMAN: I don't disagree with that at all, Your Honor. But on the other hand, I would say if you have a 40-year-old in here without a criminal history, he's gone a whole lot longer without getting in trouble. This man, at 20 --

THE COURT: Yeah --

MS. ALTMAN: -- has gotten in trouble numerous times just by age 20.

THE COURT: -- which brings me to the second concern that I have and that is that I want to be really fair and kind of dispassionate about assessing his

criminal history. And so that's why I think the clarification about the factual information in paragraph 64, which isn't part of the conviction, it's important to get a sense of that. That, of course, as I said, if that were a conviction for a kidnapping and raping a 15-year-old, even if he was only 15 years old, that would be a horse of a completely different color and so that is -- that concerns me.

I guess the bottom line here is I'm worried about whether his criminal history is being amplified as a series of sex offenses for a lot of conduct that is admittedly illegal for an 18-year-old to have sexual contact with a 15-year-old. But in the context of high school, I think it probably happens much more often than we are ready to acknowledge and that he's no saint here because he's definitely noncompliant and dishonest. And so that aspect of his conduct during his high school age, I recognize that and that concerns me.

But at the same time I think he's -- I'm not sure it's really quite fair to describe him as a serial sex offender. It certainly isn't the prototypical set of circumstances that we would expect from that.

So that's -- my concern here is that I not amplify his sentence on the basis of sexual conduct which frankly I think was probably charged and prosecuted in ways that

were more aggressive than the U.S. Attorney has done here.

MS. ALTMAN: The only thing I can say in response to that, Your Honor, is I think it is pretty prolific in schools, as much as we want to say or not.

THE COURT: Yeah.

MS. ALTMAN: And the district attorney's office in Marathon County must have had some reason to pursue these charges. I don't know what they are.

THE COURT: Sometimes it's because the parents of the girl are influential and angry.

MS. ALTMAN: Sometimes.

THE COURT: And, you know, then the young man ends up getting tagged with something that the next time he does something that's sort of typically stupid, adolescent behavior then becomes worse and it spirals out of control and I'm a little bit afraid that that's what's happened to Mr. Jewell-Reigel here.

MS. ALTMAN: The only response I would have to that, Your Honor, is that -- well, a couple things. I do primarily these types of cases. I don't see men this young that often, but this is one of the -- maybe the only man I've seen with this sort of history this young. So is it happening more often? Maybe.

The other response I would say to that is it's three different girls. And so the idea that three different

sets of parents would have enough influence or clout or -we see all the time parents don't care, quite frankly,
sadly, and we send out victim letters and we don't get
anything back.

I think we have to trust that Marathon County did the right thing, just as we would like to think we would do the right thing. And rather than looking for reasons why perhaps it wasn't right, I think we have to -- we should a assume that it was.

THE COURT: Mm-mm. Okay. And then what about what is the status of KV No. 1? I didn't really hear anything from her. Has she submitted any --

MS. ALTMAN: She hasn't. We've communicated and sent notices to her family and we have not --

THE COURT: Haven't heard anything back?

MS. ALTMAN: No.

THE COURT: So there's no request for restitution or anything like that. So restitution is not an issue and I don't really have any input from her.

MS. ALTMAN: No.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Bugni, I read your memo. She voiced all the concerns that I have. And I want to be fair about Mr. Jewell-Reigel's criminal history, but, you know, I'm not ready to just dismiss it all as overzealous prosecution. And best-case scenario,

Mr. Jewell-Reigel has shown himself to be, at least during his high school years, kind of willing to lie, dishonest, and he's really insistently noncompliant. And so I think you would acknowledge that. Is that a fair amplifier of his -- it's a fact of his criminal history that I think I have to consider.

MR. BUGNI: I agree. I disagree with Ms. Altman that five years is where you start. I mean, I think you start actually much lower, but you're like "Well, I'm hemmed in by five years." It's not that five years somehow becomes like the bottom.

THE COURT: Yeah.

MR. BUGNI: It's just that you say "Well, if I didn't have a mandatory minimum, I might say your first time in prison, two or three years, that would be appropriate, but now I have to move it to five."

As far as amplification goes, I agree there's three different girls, so it doesn't become the overzealous parents. But when you really parse it, which I really tried to embrace the bad facts in this case, Girl No. 1, it's the story to get out of there. They had text messages from her. They had, you know, interviews from other people. His parents were there at the house.

THE COURT: Girl No. 1?

MR. BUGNI: I'm sorry. The 14-year-old -- the

```
1
   15-year-old, the 15-year-old alleged kidnapping victim.
 2
             THE COURT:
                       Yes. Okay.
 3
             MR. BUGNI: So you take the first one, that's why
 4
   no charges are brought. He spends three days in jail.
 5
   The truth comes out and it's belied by the facts.
   you go to the second girl, that I disagree.
 6
7
             THE COURT:
                         The second girl is?
            MR. BUGNI: The battery.
 8
 9
             THE COURT: EKH?
10
            MR. BUGNI:
                       EKH.
             THE COURT:
11
                        Yeah.
12
            MR. BUGNI: I disagree with Ms. Altman.
13
   poor prosecutorial discretion if the complaint is "We were
14
   wrestling, he poked me in the belly, he walked on my back
15
   and he shoved me between his brother and I," and then his
16
   parents are there to witness it and say "She asked him to
17
   give her a massage and walk on his back." He's not that
18
   big of guy. If some girl asked me to do that, that would
19
   be crazy. But there's nothing there that says this is
20
   criminal.
        Now, they're naive, and that's no offense to them,
21
22
   but they take the advice of their lawyer. They pay
23
   $5,000. The lawyer says, "If you take a plea deal, it
24
   will be fine." Well, that becomes an unraveling right
```

there. You know, that's where he's on probation and when

25

he gets revoked for that probation. And why does he get revoked? For consensual sexual activity with a sophomore when he's a senior at prom. That has to tell you this is amplified. You know, that's something I don't know what it was like in Fort Atkinson, but at Riverside High School that was quite a common phenomenon. And the idea that he's been selectively prosecuted for that, that does ring true.

I've only seen one other person for the senior-sophomore sex offender. That was Joshua Van Haften. Josh Van Haften was the only other time I've seen, in all the hundreds of people I've defended, with second degree sexual assault because they were a senior in high school and so was the sophomore. That's all that they needed was that.

Now, is he noncompliant? Clearly. But is he noncompliant in a way that we normally think of noncompliance? He's not smoking weed. He's not drinking. He's not going out, you know, breaking down mailboxes. He's not getting in fights. He's lonely and he likes girls.

Now, I agree he should have stayed away from all girls. And believe me, talking to his parents, they tried to intercede. They're like, "You just need to take a break, man. You just need to be away from everyone." But

he's online and in some ways that's sort of like the no-harm zone. We know it's a harm zone. He now has it drilled into him that's a harm zone. But he's not having this daily contact with minors.

So you're right, he's noncompliant in the fact that he was online, he's talking to girls and he asks for pictures. But he's not noncompliant in that he's refusing to work. He's working. He's going to school. He's doing all those other things.

So this really is a case where the criminal history is aggravating and really it's a piling on. I mean, you see the snowball effect of you're right, we're talking about a 20-year-old, a 20-year-old that is facing this much time based upon these series of events.

I think it's more than adequately punished with five years. I think we can all rest and say that's a lot of time. That's lot of time for a young man. That's a lot of time for this crime. It's a lot of time that we know is going to change him.

You know, the other reason that I disagree with Ms. Altman is at 40, your behavior is kind of set. If you're 40 and you're going after a 12-year-old, that's weird. And that's just -- you know, you can't do that.

But you're in World of Wizard or Wizard 101 and you're talking to a girl and you're lying about how old

you are and you don't have the good sense to not do it.

There's something less that says at 25 you're going to

grow out of this or you should grow out of it. And if you

don't, you're going to be on supervision for the rest -
you know, for the next ten years after that.

So there's a lot that goes into this sentence that you can rest assured that allowing him to be released at 25 should more than adequately protect the public, drive the message home for him, but also provide just punishment.

You know, this isn't somebody who had a collection of child pornography. He is part of this generation that for some reason or another people send naked pictures of themselves to one another.

THE COURT: Well, we've had -- I mean, we have over 200 nude images of the victim.

MR. BUGNI: They have 140 I believe of the victim, but he had 200 images of other, you know, girls that -- throughout the time. And, Judge, if I can just put it into perspective. When he's 15, the 15-year-old is sending him naked photos, you know, and he's sending the 15-year-old naked photos. So it's weird. Really, man.

THE COURT: I'm with you. I'm pretty distant from the phenomenon in real life, but I see a lot of it here on the bench. You know, I see people who are charged

with child pornography offenses. So I just -- I have a hard time understanding what the ordinary norms of social media and person-to-person electronic communication in a high school or among young adults would be.

MR. BUGNI: I agree. I think you've got to say like we're seeing it enough and we see it from anybody from Brett Favre when he's starting for the Jets --

THE COURT: Don't remind me.

MR. BUGNI: Yeah. -- to Peter Jewell-Reigel.

Like this has sort of like -- this has become the norm.

It's not cool. It's something that I think society, in a hundred years, will say like "What were you doing?" The bell bottoms of the 2010s.

THE COURT: I don't think I'm quite ready to say it's the norm, but --

MR. BUGNI: But it's happening more than it really should. That's what -- here's the main point: It's not indicative of somebody who's nefarious. It's not indicative of something that's like you are now a twisted individual. You know, if there's videos of him killing cats, I'd be like "Dude, no. That's just strange."

THE COURT: Well, let's explore that a little bit then because I have to say, among the most disturbing -- in fact the single-most disturbing thing here is that, you know, a lot of times I have the victim has presented

herself or himself as older than they really were, so there's an argument that the defendant didn't know that they were 14 or whatever.

MR. BUGNI: Yeah.

we've got somebody who has acknowledged to be 12. Nobody is trying to argue that she looked older or anything like that. There was no mistaking she was a 12-year-old and it is the lewdest kind of photographs and the nastiest kind of chat. Now, she was a participant in it in that she also participated in conversation that just seems completely crazy rough for a 12-year-old girl.

MR. BUGNI: Yes.

THE COURT: Frankly, it seems kind of far out for somebody who's 20. But it's like the crudest, roughest kind of chat. It seems it would be so damaging to this 12-year-old girl, even if he didn't meet her, just to have her early sexual experiences be of this nature. It's harmful to the victim and it's way out there.

MR. BUGNI: It totally is. Man, I've got a 12-year-old at home. I totally agree with that. And I don't mean this sounds callous, but part of it is Lucy Bugni is not capable of having that initial conversation or at least I hope not. But we see this.

We've had this in a few cases before where the

conversations, it's not that they're out of space and they're talking about the Disney Channel and Liv and Maddie. Instead, she knows what's going on. That's the only way you can have this conversation back and forth and that's the only way within -- I believe it's an hour and 43 minutes of initially talking that they're exchanging photographs. So I agree it's damaging, but I don't believe that he's stripped her innocence.

And I think like when we talk about that, it's those who are grooming people. I know we had that young man who posed as like a 12-year-old. And he's like "Hey, send me the photos." Those are the guys who like "Yeah, you've done some real harm here."

And it's not to say that because she's a little bit damaged or because she was more experienced than we would like a 20-year-old to be, let alone a 12-year-old, that she's any less a victim, but it says the harm that's being done by Mr. Jewell-Reigel is a little bit less. And I don't think that because of that the harm to her has become so much greater. I think it's just a sad fact that 12-year-olds now talk like this.

Ms. Altman and I had one case with an 11-year-old that it shocked the conscience what this girl texted where I was like "This can't actually happen," but yet it's happening more and more. It's not again that

Jewell-Reigel is on an appropriate website targeting 12-year-olds girls and trying to pose as it; it's that he's on an age appropriate website that also draws people that are under age and he didn't have the good sense to follow the law and abandon as soon as she said that she was not 18.

So I think there is a huge world of difference when you're calculating your appropriate punishment and redressing this crime. You have to say again this is not somebody who's trying to pretend that he's something that he's not to seduce somebody who otherwise that would not be. In that way the harm is much different.

THE COURT: All right. Anything else?

MR. BUGNI: Judge, let me just see in my notes.

I do want to say this, that there is a lot that happens with the maturity between 20 and 25. When I look back at like that sophomore going into law school, that age gap and the maturity that we can hope for from

Mr. Jewell-Reigel is not just seen in like "Here you go, now he's caught and now he's going to make hopefully an impassionate speech to you"; it's that he's not building upon a totally flawed foundation.

That behavior, those criminal convictions, I think they overstate both the actions that took place, but they don't represent the kind of person he is. You can see his

folks are here. You can see his aunt. You can see his grades. You can see like his involvement with the trumpet, the ability to play music by ear.

This is somebody who I hope that a five-year sentence will have that corrective action and it should allow this court to take some comfort that this guy is not going to become Josh Van Haften; God help us. But this guy is somebody who, hopefully in 15 years, people will say "Get out of here. You went to this prison, federal prison? That's amazing. Tell me your story," and he gives much of that indicia. There's more to him than I believe what those criminal conversations bear out and what they should lead you to sentence him as.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Jewell-Reigel, you don't have to say anything, but you've got the right to address me before I decide on your sentence and I'd like to hear from you. So do you have anything to tell me?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Let's talk.

THE DEFENDANT: Well, I'd like to apologize, start out by apologizing for my actions. They were totally unacceptable and nothing I can say or do will be capable for rendering them justified.

I'd like to apologize also to the family that I wronged. I'd like to apologize to my family and to my

friends for letting them down again. And I'd like to apologize also to the justice system for wasting ample opportunities presented to me to turn my life around.

I admit I messed up in the worst possible way and I'm tired of letting my mistakes get the best of me. I am fully prepared to accept full responsibility of my actions and a clear consequence is prison time.

And on that subject, I'd like to note that I was able to watch a movie titled Shawshank Redemption.

Unfortunately, I was unable to finish it. But from what I could gather, I really admired the main actor or Andy

DuFresne. I admired his demeanor, the way he kept his head up, stayed strong and the way he kept himself and just never really let things bother him too much. And seeing this has helped me to relax a little bit because it's been really hard. And it also reminded me that if I do the same -- keep my head up and just stay strong -- that I can make an awesome comeback in my own way.

And also I'd like to mention a novel that I haven't finished but, it was titled Les Mis. I never pronounce the full name, so please forgive me. But the reason I bring this up is because I was able to relate to the character Jean Valjean when he was in his moment of weakness. He stole money from a child and he felt bad for it afterwards.

Now, it is said in the book that the man and the beast are one in the same; however, the beast will commit the atrocities and the man will feel bad afterwards. So what I'm trying to say is that I would like to rid myself of the beast and to become the best man yet possible.

And I'm honestly excited to receive the help I need to turn a new leaf. In the future I would like -- I would love to show that I still have a lot of fight left in me and I would love also to repay all the kindness and support that has been shown to me.

Thank you. That's all.

THE COURT: All right. What do you see for your future; what do you want to accomplish?

THE DEFENDANT: Well, as you're aware, I was going to school. I know it's going to be tough when I get out, but I would still -- I'm -- just because of the way I was brought up and raised, I just really feel I need to -- I would love to get a career. But even if I can't, I'd still -- I'm not going to give up. I would like to get a job trade or some sort of way to support myself and also to support my parents when they need me. And I just don't -- what I'm trying to say is I really don't want to give up. I want to -- I don't know exactly what I'm going to do, but I'm not going to just give up.

THE COURT: All right. So what led you to the

```
1
    Les Mis book, because Mr. Bugni quotes that a lot. I'm
 2
   wondering if he fed that to you.
 3
             THE DEFENDANT: Yeah, it was actually him.
             THE COURT: He gave it to you, didn't he?
 4
 5
             THE DEFENDANT:
                            He did.
             THE COURT: All right.
 6
 7
             THE DEFENDANT:
                             However, I --
                        He has to expand his reading list.
 8
             THE COURT:
                       I just want to be clear.
 9
             MR. BUGNI:
                                                    I didn't
10
    feed him that line; I made him read the book.
                             I actually --
11
             THE DEFENDANT:
12
             THE COURT: We're going to get you some new
13
   books.
14
             THE DEFENDANT: That would be awesome, because I
15
   do -- back in history class we had to read books.
16
   back then I'd wait for the bell to ring, go out and have
17
    fun. But now, being 20 and remembering my years in high
18
   school, I actually find that I really enjoy speaking and I
19
   enjoy learning things.
20
        And reading Les Mis was actually awesome because I
21
   was able to feel that the skills I've learned in high
22
   school and actually be able to read even those Old
23
   English.
             It was really awesome to be able to still follow
24
   along. I also love Phantom of the Opera and I love these
25
    classics.
```

THE COURT: Okay. It's awkward to talk about these things because they're not the usual things that we talk about in public, but I got to ask about your sexual interests. So like why a 12-year-old girl?

THE DEFENDANT: Honestly, when we were talking, it was really -- it clouded my judgment, but also just being young and I guess I was more just sexually active, more than I would like to be.

THE COURT: It's a normal interest. But what I'm trying to get at is are you just interested in 15-year-old girls and 12-year-old girls; are you interested in people your own age?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes. Actually, I'm more interested in people my own age. It's just sometimes I come across people who are younger, but also sexually active. But after I had gotten out from my four-month jail experience, I had gotten out, I was actually with people, like a relationship. I was actually with people my own age.

THE COURT: I mean, because in the high school context, you know, you were 18 as a senior.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: You ended up interested in a sophomore girl. Why not somebody in your own class or somebody who is 18?

of happened that way. She was the manager of the wrestling team and I was on the wrestling team and it's just we talked more than I really talked with anyone that was in my grade at the time. That's just really all that there was to it. We just ended up talking more, were more friendly with each other.

Don't get me wrong, I did talk to people in my own grade. There was just not really any connections. But had there been, I absolutely would have gone for somebody that was with me.

THE COURT: And so what kind of understanding have you gained about your interactions with the 12-year-old girl that you met through the wizards game?

THE DEFENDANT: I understand that I need to strengthen my judgment and my just being more wise. I need to -- I understand I need to step back sometimes and ask myself what am I doing, why am I doing this, what kinds of consequence will this have. Before I did not think as much as for consequences.

THE COURT: The other aspect of your conduct that concerns me is your willingness to lie to cover things up. So when you had the young lady who was hiding in the closet, the police came looking for her, the parents must have been out of their minds worried about her and you

knew where she was and you lied about the fact that you had her.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes. That I would say I was definitely not thinking actually about anyone other than her and myself at the time. And looking back I definitely see that I had affected a lot more lives than what I was thinking at the time.

THE COURT: All right. Anything else you want to tell me?

THE DEFENDANT: No matter what sentence I end up getting, I will understand that you, from what I can see just listening to you talk between prosecutor and my defender, that you have good judgment. And I just want to say that no matter what you decide that I will make effective use of the time that you have -- you give to me to turn my life around so that we don't have this conversation ever again.

THE COURT: All right. Okay. Thank you. I'm going to take a brief recess and we'll come back and finish up the sentence.

(Recess at 2:49 p.m. until 2:55 p.m.)

THE COURT: All right. Let me begin by thanking counsel for their presentation. And again I want to express my appreciation for the way the case is prosecuted. I think it could have been much more

draconian. It's a difficult case for all sorts of reasons. So let me just give you my reasons for how I have settled on the sentence I'm settling on.

I want to say first that I am, Mr. Jewell-Reigel, I am really horrified by your conduct with that 12-year-old girl. I do have the impression or believe that, as Mr. Bugni says, that this wasn't her first sexual experience, so I think that it's unfortunate that she found herself where she was. But instead of staying away from her, you kind of took advantage of the fact that she was in that kind of place where, for whatever reason at the age of 12, she had embraced some really -- adult doesn't even capture it -- attitudes about sex and sexuality and you kind of took advantage of her. She probably had already been victimized by someone to have that kind of ideas about sex and you took advantage of that. So I think this is really a very serious crime.

And I have to say and I want you to come to a realization that the way your conversation went with that young lady is not what healthy sexual relationships look like. That's just not how you should treat anybody in a sexual relationship, let alone a 12-year-old girl, and so I take this seriously.

And of course then you've got the images, which there's nothing here to suggest that these images

circulated widely, but I think it's just a very dangerous and destructive thing to have young people circulating images of their genitals and sexual activity to people they meet on the internet. It's very unhealthy. It's not something that you should do and it's not something that you should participate in. It's very damaging to the participants.

But I really don't think that you're an irredeemable person. I just can't -- I have to consider not only the crime, but the offender. I have to make an assessment of you and your character. And you're presented in the presentence report as somebody with a history of sex offenses, but I feel an obligation to really look behind the fact of these convictions and the fact that you violated your parole or your supervision and really try to figure out really what's going on there.

And I have to say that I think your criminal history really is -- and again I have my concerns about your dishonesty with the police when you had the runaway in the closet, but I think most of it I would understand as kind of bad judgment that's within the ordinary range of bad judgment that a teenager displays. Maybe you were more sexually active than some.

But I think that when I look at it, the problems that I see are really your dishonesty in dealing with the girl

who ran away. I think that prosecution with the victim EWK [verbatim] or the battery charge, I have to say I shared Mr. Bugni's view of that. I have a hard time understanding how that gets prosecuted. That puts you on supervision so that when you engage in the ill-advised senior-sophomore romance that that then gets amplified into a violation of your supervision and it gets you into court again, whereas -- and again I'm not really endorsing the idea of an 18-year-old senior dating a 15-year-old and then having sex with her. But it's still, as I said, it's within the range that doesn't, to my way of thinking, really make you into a dangerous sex offender.

So when I look at that and I see your potential -obviously you've got a lot of family support, you've got
talents, an education that you were working on -- I really
don't see you as an irredeemable person; I see you as a
person who fundamentally has a lot to offer.

And so the bottom line in terms of your term of incarceration, I think five years enough. I think that five years is a long sentence, particularly for somebody who's 20 years old. That must seem like a long time to you. And as horrified as I am of your conduct with a 12-year-old girl, I just can't think that there's a need to punish you for more than five years for that action and so I will impose the mandatory minimum.

I don't have to consider whether a lesser sentence would be appropriate. I will say, as I've said before, judges hate mandatory minimum sentences because I can always give five years if I need to, but I think this is a case in which five years of punishment is enough.

And I do not at all want to diminish the seriousness of the offense that you committed with the 12-year-old victim. And it's also, I note, you had other 16-year-old girls that you were communicating with. It's not okay to get pictures of them naked either. I don't know for sure that you have those, but there were some pictures of some other people. You're engaged in some sort of sexual communications with 16-year-olds.

You just have to realize that you're now an adult and there is nothing wrong with being interested in sex, but you have to have partners who are your equal in age. And I hope that you embrace some growing maturity and that you recognize that sex is a healthy, useful thing, but not the way that you've conducted it.

And so five years is enough. I think that a longer sentence is counterproductive to all of the interests that we have here. I think that the longer -- a sentence longer than five years will actually make it more difficult for Mr. Jewell-Reigel to achieve full rehabilitation because he's going to spend a substantial

part of his important formative years incarcerated, not learning how to deal with people in society. For me to extend that I think decreases the chances that he will be able not only achieve the goals that he has when he gets out of prison, but to make him into a healthy law-abiding citizen that can have an appropriate romantic sexual relationship with an adult person. I just think it gets harder the longer we keep him incarcerated and so I'm going to impose the mandatory minimum of five years.

I'm stuck with the five years. I think substantial punishment is warranted. But looking long term, I don't think I make anybody safer by having Mr. Jewell-Reigel incarcerated for a longer period than that. I want him to come back and pick up and live the life that he's capable of.

I am going to impose a relatively long period of supervised release of eight years. I have to do at least five years. But I'm going to, as a hedge against my being wrong in my judgment about Mr. Jewell-Reigel's character, I'm going to impose a term of supervised release of eight years.

And I think that eight years is an appropriate public protective measure that we can take to make sure that Mr. Jewell-Reigel is not engaging in the conduct that got him here. I think we can do that without having him

incarcerated any further than the five years, so I will impose the eight years.

The terms are proposed and justified in the presentence report and those are the ones that I'm inclined to impose. I didn't get any objections to them, but let me hear from Mr. Bugni if he has any concerns or objections with those conditions.

MR. BUGNI: We have no objection. We would waive reading as well.

THE COURT: All right. And are they adequately justified in the presentence report?

MR. BUGNI: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And, Ms. Altman, I think it's important for the government to weigh in, too. Do you have any objections or additional conditions that you would propose?

MS. ALTMAN: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. So I won't read them into the record here, Mr. Jewell-Reigel. It can become tedious. They're in writing. They govern your conduct. Read them over carefully. You'll have to sign and acknowledge them. And I think they're appropriate here. I've looked at them.

I will also say that they can be amended when you begin your supervision or during your supervision if we

charges?

need to adjust them to consider the needs that you have at the time or if more conditions or restrictions are appropriate or if you want relief of some of these or adjustments during your supervision, so they can be changed.

So I will also provide, because I think the five-year sentence is a long one, I will provide that the federal sentence that I impose today will begin to run today.

You're in primary state custody. Your sentence will begin today and it will run concurrent to any sentence that you receive on the -- I think the revocation proceedings are the only thing you've got pending now. Is that right?

MR. BUGNI: No, because they -- it would all be out of the same case number if you just put that down.

MR. BUGNI: Well, because you have a deferred prosecution agreement, then there's a violation of the deferred prosecution agreement, which gives the prosecutor

THE COURT: Okay. So are there other pending

THE COURT: Okay. So I will provide that my federal sentence here will run concurrent to any state sentence that he would receive.

the decision what they want to do.

Okay. Let's make sure that I've covered the formalities. I think I've covered how my sentence runs

with the state sentence. I've covered supervised release.

The offense is not drug related. The defendant doesn't have any history of drug use. Therefore, I will waive the requirement of drug testing that would otherwise be required under Title 18, United States Code, Section 3583(d).

It is adjudged that the defendant is to pay the mandatory \$100 criminal assessment penalty to the Clerk of Court for the Western District of Wisconsin immediately following the sentencing.

Restitution would be required if there were a request for it. But there is no request, so there is -- there will be no restitution order.

I do find that the defendant does not have the means to pay a fine under guideline section 5E1.2(c) without impairing his ability to support himself upon release, so I impose no fine.

I do find that the defendant is indigent and is therefore unable to pay the \$5,000 assessment under the Justice For Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015, so I will not impose that special assessment.

And I will grant the final order of forfeiture under Title 18, United States Code, Section 2253 for the property that was seized and subject to forfeiture.

The probation office is to notify local law

enforcement agencies and the state attorney general of the defendant's release to the community.

And I believe that we've got Counts 2 and 3 are to be dismissed. Is that correct, Ms. Altman?

MS. ALTMAN: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Counts 2 and 3 are dismissed then. And then, Mr. Jewell-Reigel, you have voluntarily -- knowingly and voluntarily waived your right to appeal your conviction and any sentence of imprisonment that's of 240 months or less. The sentence that I've imposed is below that level, so I believe that the waiver of your appeal rights would be effective.

Nevertheless, there is always some possibility that you have some residual right to make an appeal. If you were to do that, if you had any rights to make an appeal and you wanted to appeal, you have to do it subject to deadlines, so I'm going to give you those deadlines. And that is, if you want to file an appeal, you must file a notice of appeal within 14 days of entry of judgment or within 14 days of any notice of appeal that would be filed by the government.

If you can't afford the filing fee for an appeal, you can apply for leave to appeal in forma pauperis, which means without paying the filing fee. And if you can't afford an attorney to represent you in the appeal, you can

```
apply for court-appointed counsel at government expense to
 1
 2
   represent you.
 3
         I think I have covered everything, but let's check in
 4
   and see if there's anything else I need to address here.
 5
         Ms. Altman, anything?
             MS. ALTMAN: Nothing for me, Your Honor.
 6
 7
   you.
             MR. BUGNI: Nothing for the defense, Your Honor.
 8
             THE COURT: Very good. Mr. Williams?
 9
10
             OFFICER WILLIAMS: No, Your Honor. Thank you.
11
             THE COURT: Very good. Thank you all.
         (Adjourned at 3:09 p.m.)
12
                                * * *
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

I, CHERYL A. SEEMAN, Certified Realtime and Merit Reporter, in and for the State of Wisconsin, certify that the foregoing is a true and accurate record of the proceedings held on the 7th day of March, 2019, before the Honorable James D. Peterson, Chief Judge of the Western District of Wisconsin, in my presence and reduced to writing in accordance with my stenographic notes made at said time and place. Dated this 18th day of March, 2019. /s/ Cheryl A. Seeman, RMR, CRR Federal Court Reporter The foregoing certification of this transcript does not apply to any reproduction of the same by any means unless under the direct control and/or direction of the certifying reporter.